

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Status of Claims:

Claims 4, 8 and 18 are currently being cancelled.

Claims 1, 5, 7, 15 and 19 are currently being amended.

No claims are currently being added.

This amendment and reply cancels and amends claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After canceling and amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-17 and 19-20 are now pending in this application.

Claim Rejections – Prior Art:

In the final Office Action, claims 1, 2, 5, 9-11, 15, 16 and 19-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0033431 to Shinomiya in view of JP 200115197A to Sai; claims 3, 7, 14 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shinomiya in view of Sai and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0221127 to Ang; and claims 4, 8, 12, 13 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shinomiya in view of Sai and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,497,480 to Hayes. These rejections are traversed for at least the reasons given below.

Presently pending independent claim 1 has been amended to include the features of dependent claim 4, now canceled. Presently pending independent claim 5 has been amended to include the features of dependent claim 8, now canceled. Presently pending independent claim 15 has been amended to include the features of dependent claim 18, now canceled. Presently pending independent claim 19 has been amended in a similar manner as the other independent claims.

In its rejection of dependent claims 4, 8 and 18, the final Office Action cited column 2, lines 23-34 of Hayes for allegedly teaching certain features in those claims. However, Hayes does not teach or suggest the claimed features in which, for different communication packets which have the same identification number of the processing command, the same translation look aside buffer entry is used by said reception section of said communication device. Rather, column 2, lines 23-34 of Hayes merely discloses removal of a page table entry from a plurality of TLBs coupled to a plurality of processors. In the method of Hayes, a request packet is issued by a first controller of a first TLB to remove a page table entry from the first TLB, and the request packet is sent to a second controller coupled to a second TLB. The second controller then determines whether the second TLB contains the page table entry by comparing information in the request packet, and it removes the page table entry from the second TLB if it is contained there. Lastly, the second controller issues a reply packet to indicate completion to the first controller of its manipulation of the second TLB.

As is clear from the above description of Hayes, column 2, lines 23-34 of that reference says nothing about using the same TLB by a reception section of a communication device for different communication packets which have the same identification number of a processing command. Rather, this portion of Hayes is directed to a processor making a change to data stored in one TLB and then causing other TLBs in a same system of processors to make the same change.

Accordingly, since none of the other cited art of record rectifies the above-mentioned deficiencies of Hayes, presently pending independent claims 1, 5, 15 and 19 patentably distinguish over the cited art of record.

Conclusion:


Since all of the issues raised in the final Office Action have been addressed in this Amendment and Reply, Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by the credit card payment instructions in EFS-Web being incorrect or absent, resulting in a rejected or incorrect credit card transaction, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 4/3/2010

By 

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 945-6014
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

George C. Beck
Registration No. 38,072

Phillip J. Articola
Registration No. 38,819